UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/763,393	01/26/2004	Richard L. Veech	604-707	4584
23117 NIXON & VA	7590 06/23/200 NDERHYE, PC	EXAMINER		
	LEBE ROAD, 11TH F	THOMAS, TIMOTHY P		
ARLINGTON, VA 22203			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1614	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/23/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/763,393	VEECH, RICHARD L.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	TIMOTHY P. THOMAS	1614
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tinwill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>17 M</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This Since this application is in condition for alloware closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final.	
Disposition of Claims		
4) ☐ Claim(s) 32-34 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 32-34 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o Application Papers 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accer	wn from consideration. r election requirement.	- Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list 	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) \(\overline{\text{N}} \) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) ☐ Interview Summary	(PTO-413)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate

Application/Control Number: 10/763,393 Page 2

Art Unit: 1614

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 3/17/2009 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

- 2. Applicants' arguments, filed 3/17/2009, have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive. Rejections and/or objections not reiterated from previous office actions are hereby withdrawn. The following rejections and/or objections are either reiterated or newly applied. They constitute the complete set presently being applied to the instant application.
- 3. Applicant's arguments, see pp.3-4, filed 3/17/2009, with respect to the rejection under 35 USC 102 as anticipated by Martin have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection of claims 32-33 has been withdrawn.

The claim amendment renders the subject matter as supported by the published application of PCT/US98/05072, establishing an earlier priority date than the dates available for Martin.

Application/Control Number: 10/763,393 Page 3

Art Unit: 1614

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35
U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this
Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
 - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 - 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 7. Claims 32-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Horrobin (US 5,198,468; 1993).

Horrobin teaches treatment of memory loss with a medicament consisting of a n-6 essential fatty acid selected from GLA, DGLA, AA, adrenic acid and the

Application/Control Number: 10/763,393

Art Unit: 1614

22:5 n-6 acid and an n-3 essential fatty acid selected from 18:4 n-3 and 20:4 n-3 acids, EPA, the 22:5 n-3 acid and DHA (abstract); the individual treated includes a person suffering from deterioration of memory associated with physiological aging (claim 1); the effective amount of fatty acids administered is 1 mg to 100 g per day (claim 1), and 10 mg to 10 g per day (claim 2); 225 mg amounts were given twice daily (450 mg/day) to demented geriatric patients; treated patients had improvement in remembering their way around the hospital, among other aspects (col. 11-12, Example II); improvement was seen in both short-term (74-83%) and long-term memory (58.7-75%) with two trials of Alzheimer's patients (col. 12-14, Example IIIa and IIIb).

It is noted that Horrobin does not teach blood levels of D-β-hydroxybutyric acid or acetoacetate. However, the upper level of the amounts of 100g is in the same range as the daily total of fat in the sample diet of instant Table I.

Therefore, amounts of the upper level amounts or 10 to 100 g would characteristically result in blood levels within the required range of claim 32, based on the fat amounts taught as suitable in the instant specification, absent evidence to the contrary.

It is noted that In re Best (195 USPQ 430) and In re Fitzgerald (205 USPQ 594) discuss the support of rejections wherein the prior art discloses subject matter which there is reason to believe inherently includes functions that are newly cited or is identical to a product instantly claimed. In such a situation the burden is shifted to the applicants to "prove that subject matter shown to be in

Art Unit: 1614

the prior art does not possess characteristic relied on" (205 USPQ 594, second column, first full paragraph).

Conclusion

- 8. No claim is allowed.
- 9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TIMOTHY P. THOMAS whose telephone number is (571)272-8994. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 6:30 a.m. 5:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ardin Marschel can be reached on (571) 272-0718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/763,393 Page 6

Art Unit: 1614

/Timothy P Thomas/ Examiner, Art Unit 1614

/Ardin Marschel/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1614